UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/639,960	08/16/2000	Ligy Kurian	COMP:0080	6120

7590 02/23/2006

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
LEGAL DEPT., M/S 35
PO BOX 272400
FT. COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER	
CALLAHAN, PAUL E	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2137	

DATE MAILED: 02/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/639,960	KURIAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Paul Callahan	2137	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *01 December 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-9,11 and 25-28* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-9,11 and 25-28* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-33 were pending at the time of the previous Office Action in the case. Claims 10, 12-24, and 29-33 have been cancelled as per the Amendment filed 12-01-2005. Therefore claims 1-9, 11, and 25-28 remain pending and have been examined.

Allowable Subject Matter

2. The indicated allowability of claims 1-9, and 11 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to Abbott et al. US 6,671,808 B1. Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow. The indicated allowability of claims 25-28 is withdrawn after further review of the Bork reference.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Abbott et al., US 6,671,808 B1

As for claim 1, Abbott teaches an electronic system (col. 4 lines 51-52: "computer system") comprising: at least one device having a universal serial bus (USB) port

externally exposed (fig. 1 element 130, col. 3 lines 26-30); a wireless communication system for communicating information between a plurality of separate devices (col. 3 lines 56-62, col. 6 lines 62-66), the wireless communication system comprising: a dongle (fig. 1 element 200, figs. 2a-2c) having an antenna for transmitting and receiving information (col. 6 lines 62-66: An antenna is inherent to the ability of the dongle or "hardware key" to function as a paging transceiver. The term transceiver is a standard contraction for "Transmitter/Receiver", col. 8 lines 20-25), a USB connector for selective mating engagement with the USB port (col. 5 lines 11-13), wherein the weight of the dongle is supported entirely by the mating engagement of the USB connector to the USB port (fig. 1 elements 130 and 200, fig. 6K).

As for claim 2, Abbott teaches the system as recited in claim 1, further comprising: a transmitter electrically coupled to the antenna (col. 6 lines 62-66: An antenna is inherent to the ability of the dongle or "hardware key" to function as a paging transceiver. The term transceiver is a standard contraction for "Transmitter/Receiver", col. 8 lines 20-25).

As for claim 3, Abbott teaches the system as recited in claim 2, wherein the transmitter is disposed within the dongle (col. 6 lines 62-66: An antenna is inherent to the ability of the dongle or "hardware key" to function as a paging transceiver. The term transceiver is a standard contraction for "Transmitter/Receiver", col. 8 lines 20-25).

As for claim 4, Abbott teaches the system as recited in claim 1, further comprising: a receiver electrically coupled to the antenna (col. 6 lines 62-66: An antenna is inherent to the ability of the dongle or "hardware key" to function as a paging transceiver. The term transceiver is a standard contraction for "Transmitter/Receiver", col. 8 lines 20-25).

As for claim 5, Abbott teaches the system as recited in claim 4, wherein the receiver is disposed within the dongle (col. 6 lines 62-66: An antenna is inherent to the ability of the dongle or "hardware key" to function as a paging transceiver. The term transceiver is a standard contraction for "Transmitter/Receiver", col. 8 lines 20-25).

5. Claims 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Bork, US 6,255,800 B1.

As for claim 25, Bork teaches a computer system, comprising:
a central processing unit having an enclosure (fig. 10 element 10, fig. 11 elements 42 and 46), the enclosure having a first universal serial bus (USB) port (Abstract, col. 6 lines 40-44, col. 7 lines 25-27); a peripheral device having a second recessed USB port (col. 5 lines 52-65: The USB port-configured computer with attached Bluetooth-capable cradle is taught as being capable of communicating with a similar unit, which therefore reads on the applicant's second peripheral device with a USB port); and a wireless communication system for communicating information between the central processing

unit and the peripheral device (fig. 10 element 44, col. 7 lines 10-15, fig. 12 element 46), the wireless communication system comprising: at least one communication dongle having an antenna for transmitting and receiving information (fig. 10 element 42, col. 5 lines 50-67) and a USB connector for selective mating engagement with the first USB port and the second USB port (Abstract, col. 6 lines 40-44, col. 7 lines 25-27); a peripheral device having a second recessed USB port (col. 3 lines 1-25, col. 5 lines 52-65: The USB port-configured computer with attached Bluetooth-capable cradle is taught as being capable of communicating with a similar unit, which therefore reads on the applicant's second peripheral device with a USB port); and a data transceiver electrically coupled to the at least one communication dongle (fig. 11 element 44, fig. 12 element 46).

As for claim 26, Bork teaches the system as recited in claim 25, wherein the data transceiver is disposed within the at least one communication dongle (fig.11 element 44).

As for claim 27, Bork teaches the system as recited in claim 25, wherein the wireless communication system utilizes an industry standard for wireless communication devices (col. 5 lines 35-47).

As for claim 28, Bork teaches the system as recited in claim 27, wherein the industry standard is Bluetooth (col. 5 lines 35-47).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abbott.

As for claim 6, Abbott teaches the system of claim 1, but does not explicitly teach a step wherein the communication system utilizes a wireless communication standard, although such would be a requirement of the wireless paging function so taught. However, Official Notice may be taken that such a step is one that is old and well known in the art of wireless communications. The wireless USB protocol is but one well-known example. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into the system of Abbott. It would have been desirable to do so since this would allow for greater interoperability of the system with commercially available wireless-communications peripherals supplied by other vendors.

8. Claims 7-9, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abbott and Official Notice as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of Bork, US 6,255,800.

As for claim 7, the combination of Abbott and Official Notice teach the system as recited in claim 6, but do not teach a step wherein the wireless communication standard is the Bluetooth wireless communication standard. However Bork does teach the use of the Bluetooth wireless communication protocol in a system such as Abbott's (Abstract, fig. 2, fig. 14). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into the system of Abbott. Motive to make this combination is found, for example, in col. 1 lines 14-51 where the advantages of RF communications between a computer and peripherals is discussed.

As for claim 8, Abbott teaches the system as recited in claim 7, further comprising an integrated circuit, the integrated circuit being a transceiver electrically coupled to the antenna (col. 5 lines 41-46 and 60-64, col. 6 lines 62-66: An antenna is inherent to the ability of the dongle or "hardware key" to function as a paging transceiver. The term transceiver is a standard contraction for "Transmitter/Receiver", col. 8 lines 20-25).

As for claim 9, Abbot teaches the system as recited in claim 8, wherein the integrated circuit is disposed within the dongle (col. 5 lines 41-46).

As for claim 11, Abbott teaches the system as recited in claim 8, wherein the at least one device comprises an enclosure and the integrated circuit is disposed within the enclosure and electrically coupled to the antenna in the dongle (col. 5 lines 41-46

and 60-64, col. 6 lines 62-66: An antenna is inherent to the ability of the dongle or "hardware key" to function as a paging transceiver. The term transceiver is a standard contraction for "Transmitter/Receiver", col. 8 lines 20-25).

Conclusion

9 Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul E. Callahan whose telephone number is (571) 272-3869. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 9 to 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise, can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is: (571) 273-8300.

2-15-06

Paul Callahan

EMMANUEL L. MOISE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER